



A “360” degree view for individual leadership development

Individual
leadership
development

Glenys Drew

*Human Resources Department, Queensland University of Technology,
Brisbane, Australia*

581

Received 17 December 2007
Revised 7 December 2008
Accepted 10 March 2009

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to explore the perceived usefulness to participants of a particular 360-degree leadership survey process to assist an understanding of how ratees receive and respond to 360-degree feedback.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper includes a sample of eight new and emergent leaders at one university in Australia who complete a 360-degree feedback survey. Through semi-structured interviews, they are asked to report on their learning as a result of undertaking the 360-degree exercise. A constant comparison method of data analysis is used to analyse the participants' responses.

Findings – The research study finds from the group undertaking the 360-degree feedback process that, in equal proportion, participants report receiving: no surprising feedback but reinforcement and affirmation; and new insights, with developmental strategies identified to effect change as a result of feedback. The paper argues, from findings of the literature and the study, the importance of a measure of institutional support for the feedback process including sound facilitation. The results of the semi-structured conversations held with the small sample attest to the importance of self-efficacy (belief of capacity to learn and develop) on the part of ratees to act on feedback gained, and of the organisation's role in assisting self-efficacy in 360-degree programs. The findings support an incremental theory approach in that participants see the feedback exercise as an opportunity to improve their capabilities and pursue learning goals over time by acting on development items suggested by the feedback. It is posited that support received by participants in undertaking the feedback activity as part of a program of development contributes to the positive response. The paper concludes by providing some guidelines for conducting effective 360-degree feedback discussions.

Originality/value – There is a reasonable body of literature about 360-degree feedback processes from a theoretical standpoint. This qualitative study addresses a relative gap in the literature to explore how participants describe their experience of undertaking a facilitated 360-degree feedback exercise, including whether they gain new knowledge, or no new knowledge. The paper also suggests some principles that might be employed in facilitating 360-degree feedback to maximise benefit from the process.

Keywords 360-degree feedback, Management development, Leadership, Australia

Paper type Research paper

Background

This study came about because of a desire to discover more about the place of 360-degree feedback in leadership and management development. The study is set in the higher education leadership environment, and is timely in a period of accelerated age-related attrition in the global tertiary leadership sector currently, placing pressure on succession leadership planning and development (Boyatzis *et al.*, 2002). The intention of the study was to investigate how 360-degree feedback might best play a role



in leadership preparation and practice improvement. Specifically, the goal was to discover more about how leaders respond to 360-degree feedback exercises and how, from the insights of the sample group, 360-degree processes might be strengthened for maximum impact.

The paper begins by examining some of the pertinent literature on 360-degree feedback processes. It then explores what might constitute an effective facilitation for a 360-degree process, and recommends some guiding principles for a constructive 360-degree feedback result interview. The second part of the paper discusses the methodology that steered the study. The findings are then presented and some implications of the study are discussed.

The 360-degree feedback for management development

Multi-source feedback and its role in wider performance management practice has been the subject of considerable study, theoretical debate, and divergent opinion. A 360-degree feedback survey, typically, is where an individual leader's staff, peers, and supervisor are invited to provide scores on a range of questions relevant to their leadership role. The leader (ratee) also provides "self" scores against which the perceptions of others are compared. Peiperl (2001, p. 143) defines this process as "peer appraisal" which "begins with a simple premise that the people best suited to judge the performance of others are those who work most closely with them." Peiperl (2001) studied for ten years, the theory behind 360-degree feedback and reports, the somewhat vexed nature of its practice. As Peiperl (2001, p. 143) says, performance management is not easy under any circumstances, and while "a certain clarity exists in the traditional form of performance review, when a boss evaluates a subordinate," some paradoxes arise in "the novelty and ambiguity of peer appraisal," the chief one being that "people are torn between being supportive colleagues or hard-nosed judges." A wider rater base, hence invoking wider opinion, may provide greater balance; however, views on the effectiveness of 360-degree feedback processes are far from uniform.

The vexed question of 360-degree surveying. Some research shows that, whether a feedback exercise invoked multi-source feedback or upward feedback only, the feedback from staff is the most important dimension to be gathered. One study by Brutus *et al.* (1999) revealed that ratees listen most to feedback from people whom they supervise. The study, covering data from 2,163 managers, showed that multi-source feedback contributed to the selection of developmental goals, and that subordinate ratings, compared to ratings from other sources, were most influential in the setting of goals. Some studies show that only limited improvement will follow.

A study involving 5,335 ratees in a large, global organisation were followed up after engaging in a multi-source feedback process to determine whether the ratee had shared the feedback and whether this appeared to have positive impact (Smither *et al.*, 2004). Smither *et al.* (2004) found a very small though statistically significant proportion of variance in improvement occurred over time. van Dierendonck *et al.* (2007) examined a sample of 45 managers and 308 staff members of a health care organisation receiving an upward feedback report and a short workshop to facilitate interpretation. The study invoked two measurement points within six months. It found that managers lack insight into the impact of their behaviour (which in itself suggests the usefulness of gaining feedback) but that the upward feedback program had small overall positive effect. The study found that managers' self-rating on key interpersonal behaviours

decreased over the two successive measurement points. (Perhaps, ratees' self-scores in subsequent surveys decreased as they became more mindful of their interpersonal behaviours and the impact of these on others.) Of the literature scanned, most authors commenting on multi-source feedback supported "in principle" the notion of leader obtaining feedback, but it would appear that the link between 360-degree feedback and development action has been relatively little researched (Maurer *et al.*, 2002). This poses a dilemma which is discussed in the following sections of this paper. While it is outside the scope of this paper to debate the range of summative and formative approaches to 360-degree applications, the paper takes as a point of reasonable theoretical agreement the felicity of 360-degree processes to aid reflective practice.

Leveraging reflective practice. Avolio (2005, p. 94) states: "To be an effective leader means to reflect, deeply reflect, on events that surround oneself that have reference to how you see our own behavior and actions influencing others." To reflect, Avolio (2005, p. 194) suggests, means "to know oneself, to be consistent with one self, and to have a positive and strength-based orientation toward one's development and the development of others." London (2002), Peiperl (2001) and Rao and Rao (2005) argue the efficacy of 360-degree feedback to aid reflective practice, particularly to improve interactive engagement in the leadership role.

Context for 360-degree feedback process. According to many workers in the field, 360-degree surveying importantly allows for participants to reflect on perceptions from a variety of observers of their work to improve self-monitoring (Avolio, 2005; Avolio *et al.*, 1999; Bass, 1997; Lepsinger and Lucia, 1997; London, 2002; Smither *et al.*, 2004). An idealised goal of 360-degree feedback is that leaders who are high self-monitors can then "adjust their behavior as they watch the impact [that their behaviour] is having on followers" (Avolio, 2005, p. 95). This paper argues that the perceived success of a 360-degree feedback process turns largely upon how the intervention is contextualised and delivered organisationally, including whether/how ratees are assisted to be high self-monitors able and willing to make adjustments where useful to do so. A gap in the literature at this point is of interest. What contextual settings appear to be the most conducive to making 360-degree processes worthwhile? Some suggestions for 360-degree feedback to leverage reflective practice for richer 360-degree feedback outcomes are proposed.

Caveats for success of 360-degree interventions

Top-down modelling/rewarding of desired behaviours. A useful question relevant to 360-degree survey success is whether the organisation appears to value and reward the behaviours reflected in the survey. Reilly *et al.* (1996) attempted to answer this question in a study of 92 managers during four iterations of an upward feedback program over two and a half years. The study found that managers whose performance was perceived by subordinates as low improved between the first and second iteration of the program and sustained that improvement two years later. The study found that rewarding and top-down modelling of desired behaviours appeared to be the most important factor leveraging improvement. Dominick *et al.* (1997) agree that people will be more motivated to develop the behaviours that they believe are rewarded. In fact, Dominick *et al.* (1997) found that employees can change behaviour merely by becoming aware of the behaviours that are rewarded in the organisation. It follows that survey participants may take their survey results on behaviours more seriously if they

perceive the relevant behaviours to be valued. As London (2002), for example, asserts, organizational leaders, from the CEO down, can empower themselves and their people to become continuous learners through use of multi-source feedback processes. This notion is closely tied to the empowering nature of organisational support provided for the 360-degree process. Ideally, this includes top-down modelling to seek and act upon feedback, and providing institutional support for skilled debriefing of reports and follow-through.

Institutional support for the 360-degree process. There is evidence to suggest that institutional support of various kinds plays a significant role in the likelihood of 360-degree processes leading to continuous improvement. Aspects of institutional support may include how the 360-degree process is to be contextualised and introduced; if and how it links to other performance assessment mechanisms; how the results will be transmitted to participants; and what mechanisms are in place to support learning and follow-through assistance (London, 2002). A study undertaken by Maurer *et al.* (2002) found that a significant difference-making element was the way in which the feedback process was implemented and facilitated.

The study examined predictors of 150 managers' attitudes toward a 360-degree feedback iteration and the extent to which the recipients of the feedback (typically ten months after receipt of feedback) had engaged in development action in response to the feedback. One of the findings reported by the authors suggested that:

[...] differences in the context in which the feedback is given and characteristics of the feedback recipients themselves [were] just as important or more important than differences in feedback level for attitudes and involvement in development activity following feedback (p. 105).

Snyder *et al.* (2007) studying the higher education management environment, similarly argue the importance of supportive institutional strategies to ensure appropriate integration of a 360-degree feedback mechanism. It is suggested, the 360-degree feedback interview should focus on relationship-building to create shared meaning and mutual understanding (Lewis and Slade, 2000) and should inspire self-motivation to learn (London, 2002). In a study published in 2004, a team of researchers were interested to discover the emphasis that raters placed on supportive and developmental forms of leadership.

In the study, Rafferty and Neale (2004) investigated notions of supportive and developmental leadership by analysing open ended comments made by respondents to the quality leadership profile (QLP). The QLP is a 360-degree feedback survey instrument tailored to leading and managing in the education/knowledge environment, used mainly by both academic and administrative leaders in Australia and New Zealand (Drew, 2006). The QLP uses a rating scale and a free text section for brief open comments. The researchers analysed QLP results over a total of 160 QLP surveys involving 1,445 raters to determine what the open-ended comments on the QLP revealed as "top of mind" issues for raters. The authors' Leximancer-based analysis found that followers appreciate and endorse supportive and developmental forms of leadership, with comments on supportive leadership predominating over other themes in the analysis. The findings suggest the importance of supportive leadership and, in turn, the benefit of organisations providing resources fostering supportive and developmental forms of leadership. It is documented that where individuals as 360-degree feedback participants perceive that support exists for development from supervisors and peers

they are “more likely to participate in development activities and have more positive attitudes toward a developmental feedback intervention” (Maurer *et al.*, 2002, p. 92).

Responding to feedback on a relevant set of capabilities, the feedback result interview ideally forms part of institutional support for a 360-degree process, assisting participants to reflect on the results. Scott *et al.* (2008) writing of the Australian tertiary leadership sector, argue the importance of working from a relevant set of capabilities as the basis for 360-degree interventions and related feedback conversations. Scott *et al.* (2008, p. 15) observe that a number of studies, “including a small number from Australia (e.g. Ramsden, 1998, Drew, 2006), shed light on the specific qualities deemed as important and necessary for leaders now and in the future.” Scott *et al.* (2008) point to the QLP, for example, as offering domains of focus and development in higher education. Their extensive study identified key leadership themes and capabilities in the Australian higher education sector and reported the need for empathy as well as self-organisation and self-regulation in leading and guiding others. Accordingly, at the feedback interview, as 360-degree participants receive support for their own development they may be assisted to build supportive and developmental forms of leadership to inspire and empower others. Hence, the feedback interview, as the ratee’s critical first encounter with the survey results, may be crucial to the leader’s engagement with the feedback and to observable outcomes. Studies have shown that professional conversations are an excellent strategy for promoting change in individuals engaging willingly in them (Healy *et al.*, 2001). Promoting listening and openness to attend to others’ views (Mackay, 1994; Petress, 1999), they may improve “on-job” performance (Seibert, 1999; Tornow and London, 1998). Relatively little appears to have been written about the 360-degree feedback conversation. Thoughts are offered below on two aspects of an “add-value” approach.

Facilitating the 360-degree feedback conversation

Effective meaning-based 360-degree feedback conversations assisted by good questions may foster recognition of “the assumptions underlying [...] beliefs and behaviours” which inevitably underlie human behaviour (Brookfield, 1987, p. 13). A skilled QLP facilitator uses good questions to help the ratee interrogate his/her own practice to affirm what behaviours might be contributing to excellent results and to explore assumptions that might lie behind any surprising negative feedback received. For example, the ratee might see himself/herself as approachable, accessible and consultative, whereas a different perception might register in staff scores. Skilled facilitation may help the leader to explore held assumptions in cognizance of the perceptions of others. Sharing their initial reactions and plans with the group, the feedback recipient indicates to staff how he/she intends to use the feedback for development (London, 2002, pp. 144, 149-54). This positions the leader positively as a listening, reflective practitioner.

Raising self-confidence to act on perceptions and effect change. The feedback conversation is an ideal time to check and build “self-efficacy” (Bandura, 1982). Self-efficacy is described as an individual’s self-belief that he/she is able to effect behavioural change (Maurer *et al.*, 2002). If it is the “experiences of success [which] persuade[s] individuals that they are able to perform the behaviour” (London, 2002, p. 149), this behoves organisations to place priority on developing leaders’ confidence in their ability to enhance their practice. Institutional support may entail providing a coach

to encourage development planning (London, 2002). Greene (2005), Mintzberg (2004), Kerr (2004) and Palus and Horth (2002) discuss the value of creating spaces for insight, artful learning and action for the enhancement of practice. The study reported in the remainder of the paper sought to discover whether a group of participants in a 360-degree process gained new insight, or no new insight, from a particular feedback process. The contextual setting for the survey process is described briefly, and comments that participants offered on issues of institutional support for the process are reported.

Contextualisation for research study undertaken

First, some comments are made on the wider cultural and contextual environment of the organisation in which the research study was undertaken. The relevant organisation, an Australian university, provides strong institutional support for development. At that university, for development purposes, the QLP 360-degree survey is undertaken twice in a five-year contract for academic and general (professional) senior staff holding significant supervisory responsibility. Participants involved in the research study enjoyed particular support for development, having been nominated by their supervisors to undertake an accelerated succession leadership development program at the relevant university. Participants were eight in number and were equally distributed across gender and across academic and professional (administrative) senior supervisory staff at the university, such as heads of school and managers of administrative sections.

Methodology

The focus of the current research was to explore the views of eight academic and administrative leaders who had used a 360-degree feedback survey process regarding the effectiveness of that process. The QLP was the 360-degree feedback instrument used by participants in this study to gain feedback on their leadership behaviours. By way of background to the instrument used, the QLP was the subject of six years of research at the Queensland University of Technology, Australia. Gathering norms since 2000, the QLP is tailored to leading and managing in education and knowledge organisations. The factor structure of the QLP is: "Staff motivation and involvement," "Strategic and operational management," "Client focus," "Community outreach" and where applicable, "Academic leadership" (Drew, 2006). The instrument operates for the development and support of senior supervisory staff in some 28 organisations in Australia and New Zealand.

The relevant 360-degree process was offered as part of a by invitation accelerated succession leadership development program conducted at an Australian university. Eight participants from the program who had been eligible to complete the QLP given their senior supervisory roles were invited to contribute to the study. All eight agreed to participate. The eight participants, five senior academic and three senior administrative staff, were interviewed individually for approximately one hour following the conclusion of the leadership program. Semi-structured interviews (Mason, 2002; Taylor and Bogdan, 1998) were designed to capture participants' reactions to the findings of the 360-degree survey component of the program.

The researcher invited participants' comments and recorded their comments on a laptop during the interview. Transcripts were confirmed with participants individually. Data analysis took the form of constant comparison analysis (Cavana *et al.*, 2001)

whereby themes were identified and coded as they emerged. As new themes emerged, these were compared with the previous ones and regrouped with similar themes. If a new meaning unit emerged, a new theme was formed (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994).

Findings

All eight participants reported that follow through for learning and development had occurred from the 360-degree feedback process. Two contrasting themes, equally represented amongst participants, derived from the analysis. The first theme was that the 360-degree survey yielded no surprising feedback but that useful reinforcement of self-perceptions had occurred. The second theme was that the process had yielded new insight and that development strategies and change had been attempted as a result. Participants' comments are examined under these two themes, followed by a number of comments offered by participants on the development experience in the context of the overall program. Those comments are included as they help further to contextualise participants' responses on the 360-degree process.

No surprising feedback: reinforcement and affirmation

The four participants reporting no surprising feedback appeared to be well in touch with their staff, peers, and supervisor. They described activities such as regular interactive meetings where issues are raised and discussed freely. London (2002) observes: people who are more self-aware are more likely to have higher self-other agreement (p. 49). Four participants reported that while there was no surprising feedback, the result in itself constituted valuable learning as it promoted reflection on what was working well, and on where to place developmental effort. For example:

The QLP is a useful tool which, for me, affirms what you have as a 'gut feeling', both positive and negative, on issues. But the negative is confirmation that you need to do something about it.

A comment reflected valuable affirmation:

The good feedback was consistent with what I get back from students. It is noticeable coming from two different quarters; comments such as an ability to listen and to reflect.

Another participant reflected that the mixture of results brought some new information and some affirmation on aspects of the role which had involved making some difficult decisions: "No real new insights although disappointed with low staff and peer score re staff development, but happy to see that my willingness to make tough decisions is acknowledged."

New insight: developmental strategies and change attempted as the result of feedback

Comments on outcomes included various resolution. One participant, for example, noted that he would pay a little more attention to looking after "self" including his responses to stress. He also said:

An insight is that if there is a high pressure situation it saturates and flaps me to some extent, and one thing I've been trying to work on is not letting it flap me, and stay in the leadership domain.

Consciousness-raising on various aspects of staff needs was reported. One participant indicated:

I gained especially around the notion of career planning. I tend not to plan my career systematically and I didn't realise that others need and like to plan systematically. The QLP feedback showed me that my staff are looking for this type of leadership from me.

Another participant's comment particularly reflected strong self-efficacy and appreciation of the 360-degree debrief process:

I think the process was a good one in facilitating real feedback and I'm happy to see the areas for improvement and can easily make improvements over the next 12 months. I think it is an effective process and simple to initiate and complete. I appreciated the "in person" debrief and particularly the assistance with interpreting the results.

Participants reported following up to share what they had gained from the process with their supervisor and to their directly reporting staff.

At the relevant university, the QLP forms the developmental aspect of the organisation's formal performance planning and review process for senior staff, to help ensure that continuous improvement is taken seriously within the organisation. One participant said:

I didn't appreciate fully the value of Performance Planning and Review (PPR) before, but reflecting back, it is useful for development and, with that realisation, one is able to 'sell' it better as a Head of School [...] They will see the benefits if they take it seriously and participate in the process.

In interpreting these findings, some biographical details of participants may be of interest. Fewer than half of the group had undertaken the 360-degree survey previously. All, however, were practicing managers/leaders in senior roles of supervisory responsibility and had engaged in programs and activities internal and external to the university to enhance their reflective practice. These factors may account for the high level of reporting no surprising feedback but affirmation of a profile that they had expected to receive. The interpretation is perhaps assisted by some comments made by participants on the development program overall.

Development program overall

A number of participants commented on the development program of which the feedback exercise formed part. The design of the development program aligned with the researched factor structure of the QLP (outlined earlier in this paper). The first module of that program had provided an introductory context for the 360-degree feedback exercise, explaining its intent for development purposes and gaining the engagement of participants. The implementation briefing to participants included a suggestion that participants advise at least their directly reporting staff that they would be inviting them to complete the survey, outlining its developmental purpose, and that the process would be confidential. Further modules of the program held approximately every six weeks over a year, had dealt with staff motivation and involvement and a range of strategic and operational issues. In informal settings, participants could interact with senior executives of the university and other presenters, and each other.

The comments of participants related mainly to supportive mechanisms provided to underpin the 360-degree feedback element. This affirmed the importance of providing social support for development identified in the study of Maurer *et al.* (2002, pp. 91, 105) and the frequent citing of "supportive leadership" in open-ended comments on QLP surveys analysed by Rafferty and Neale (2004). Participants reported benefiting from

the opportunity to discover a commonality of issues faced as they discussed informally those challenges, and insights from the module discussions, QLP and other sources, during the program. Two examples include:

The networking [...] meeting other people was a great outcome of the overall program. It was really good to see that you are not 'Robinson Crusoe'; we are all battling the same challenges [...]

The value particularly was mixing with some of the senior staff at different levels, looking at [the organisation] from their perspective, and understanding how they keep on top of the issues and remain current.

An improvement in personal confidence was another reported benefit. For example:

Interpersonally, it helped give me confidence and awareness to lift myself above petty issues to target the more strategic level ones. Now I've got the greater confidence to say 'let's work together to get the problem solved' rather than thinking that I have to fix the problem for them.

Another reported gains in strategic awareness and cross-university collaboration:

If you are trying to go for a leadership role you have to work across boundaries. Without this program you don't have that context. It broadened my understanding of how senior academic staff approach and think about various issues impacting university strategy and operations.

The research interviewing process itself was reported by participants as a helpful means of pinpointing learning. Being invited to articulate their reactions and outcomes from the "360-degree" exercise also was cited as helpful in reinforcing insights gained.

Discussion

The views of participants attested to the importance of setting in place mechanisms whereby meaningful conversations can occur on shared challenges and potential action strategies. Evidence of self-efficacy in many of the comments suggests that with a supportive scaffold for a multi-source feedback exercise, participants believed in their ability to benefit from development. That a group of participants, confident in their ability to learn, reported the 360-degree exercise a positive learning experience concurs with the observation of Maurer *et al.* (2002, p. 91) who said that "people who believe that they can improve their skills and abilities[...] feel favourably toward a feedback system that informs them of the skills or abilities that need improvement." Avolio *et al.* (1999), Bland and Ruffin (1992) and Lepsinger and Lucia (1997) agree that providing supportive frameworks for reflection increases individuals' interest in personal learning.

The overwhelming appreciation of the "human factor" associated with relationship-building and providing inspiration in many of the comments tends to affirm the importance of meaning-based, inspirational approaches to development (Healy *et al.*, 2001; Lewis and Slade, 2000; London, 2002). It might be summarised from the study that 360-degree surveys of themselves do not produce learning or change but that, with sound facilitation, the 360-degree process is a vehicle whereby learning may occur. It is believed that institutional support plays a vital role. The findings of Rafferty and Neale (2004) concerning their analysis of open ended comments on the QLP and the findings from participants' interviews concurred generally that staff seek supportive and developmental forms of leadership.

The findings concur that as more people in the organisation involve themselves in activities provided to sharpen reflection and action, favourable critical mass will develop. This was evident in the goodwill that research participants showed concerning the value of coming together to discuss shared objectives. It is consistent with claims in the literature that iterative use of reflective processes such as well facilitated 360-degree tools builds critical mass to embed desired behaviours over time (Drew, 2006; McCarthy and Garavan, 2001; Peiperl, 2001).

Overall, there was ample evidence to suggest that a supportive institutional context for a learning process adds to the potential for the process to be perceived positively and to be acted upon beneficially. The positive culture-building benefit of providing an adequate budget and resources for well-selected development activities was epitomised in one participant's comment: "I will be trying different things that I learned, not necessarily recognising that the ideas came from a particular workshop."

Implications and conclusions

It is acknowledged that the study took place in an environment when support for development existed. Whether participants would have felt so positive about the process had institutional support not been provided remains a question. It might be hypothesised that participants' positive recognition of institutional support in the subject case aligns with observations in the literature on the importance of providing such support for 360-degree ventures. Good practice, in fact, for sensitive 360-degree instruments would belie conducting such a process without a satisfactory framework, making deliberate comparison difficult. The findings positively affirm a place for 360-degree surveys as a useful tool in leadership development with the caveat that the process be supported by sound facilitation and, if possible, active institutional endorsement. The findings have implications for leadership development in universities and other knowledge organisations.

Nascent attempts at succession leadership development may have underestimated the importance of what is sometimes termed, somewhat tautologically, the "people" dimension in management roles entailing supervisory responsibility (Rao and Rao, 2005). It is suggested here that the vital element of "people engagement" is best tested through gaining systematic feedback. An implication from the findings is that senior staff as participants enter into a feedback process more willingly if they know that the process "counts" (is valued by) the organisation. The study suggests that, whether the feedback largely affirms current practice for the ratee, or identifies areas for improvement, it is most important that the ratee feels comfortable to gain the feedback and to act upon it.

This implies a duty of care for organisations using a multi-source feedback tool to ensure the instrument's relevance, contextual clarity, strategic positioning for the process, and a quality of facilitation capable of fostering self-efficacy and growth in participants. It is recommended, with Ramsden (1998), Scott *et al.* (2008) and others, that higher education organisations place budgetary resources and skilled professional assistance to inspire a positive leadership learning culture. Particularly in a time-poor environment, as the leader, in turn, models sound receipt of feedback response back to staff, situations may be resolved and new understandings reached through conversations which otherwise may not have occurred.

References

- Avolio, B.J. (2005), *Leadership Development in Balance: MADE/Born*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M. and Jung, D.I. (1999), "Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire", *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 72, pp. 441-62.
- Bandura, A. (1982), "Self-efficacy mechanisms in human agency", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 37, pp. 122-47.
- Bass, B.M. (1997), "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52, pp. 130-9.
- Bland, C.J. and Ruffin, M.T. (1992), "Characteristics of a productive research environment: literature review", *Academic Medicine*, Vol. 67, pp. 385-97.
- Boyatzis, R.E., Stubbs, E.C. and Taylor, S.N. (2002), "Learning cognitive and emotional competencies through graduate management education", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 150-62.
- Brookfield, S.D. (1987), *Developing Critical Thinkers: Challenging Adults to Explore Alternative Ways of Thinking and Acting*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Brutus, S., London, M. and Martineau, J. (1999), "The impact of 360-degree feedback on planning for career development", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 8 No. 8, pp. 676-93.
- Cavana, R.Y., Delahaye, B.L. and Sekaran, U. (2001), *Applied Business Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*, Wiley, Brisbane.
- Dominick, P., Reilly, R. and McGourty, J. (1997), "The effects of peer feedback on team member behaviour", *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 508-20.
- Drew, G. (2006), "Balancing academic advancement with business effectiveness? The dual role for university leaders", *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 117-25.
- Greene, P. (2005), "Spaces of influence: a framework for analysis of an individual's contribution within communities of practice", *Higher Education Research and Development*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 293-307.
- Healy, L., Ehrich, L.C., Hansford, B. and Stewart, D. (2001), "Conversations: a means of learning, growth and change", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 332-45.
- Kerr, C. (2004), "Developing new alliances in higher education leadership & governance: autopoietic application of the 'arts' creative capacities", *International Journal of the Humanities*, Vol. 2 No. 1, available at: <http://ijh.cgpublisher.com/product/pub.26/prod.147>
- Lepsinger, R. and Lucia, A.D. (1997), *The Art and Science of 360 Feedback*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Lewis, G. and Slade, C. (2000), *Critical Communication*, 2nd ed., Prentice-Hall, Sydney.
- London, M. (2002), *Leadership Development: Paths to Self-insight and Professional Growth*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- McCarthy, A.M. and Garavan, T.N. (2001), "360 degree feedback process: performance, improvement and employee career development", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 25, pp. 5-32.
- Mackay, H. (1994), *Why Don't People Listen*, Pan, Sydney.
- Mason, J. (2002), *Qualitative Researching*, Sage, London.

- Maurer, T.J., Mitchell, D.R.D. and Barbeite, F.G. (2002), "Predictors of attitudes toward a 360-degree feedback system and involvement in post-feedback management development activity", *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 75, pp. 87-107.
- Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R. (1994), *Beginning Qualitative Research: A Philosophic and Practical Guide*, The Falmer Press, London.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004), *Managers not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*, Berrett Koehler, San Francisco, CA.
- Palus, C.J. and Horth, D.M. (2002), *The Leader's Edge: Six Creative Competencies for Navigating Complex Challenges*, CCI/Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Peiperl, M.A. (2001), "Best practice: getting 360 degree feedback right", *Harvard Business Review*, January, pp. 142-7.
- Petress, K.C. (1999), "Listening: a vital skill", *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, Vol. 26 No. 4, p. 261.
- Rafferty, A.E. and Neale, M. (2004), "What do followers say about supportive and developmental leadership?", paper presented at the 18th Annual conference of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM), University of Otago, Otago, Full paper on CD, December.
- Ramsden, P. (1998), *Learning to Lead in Higher Education*, Routledge, London.
- Rao, T.V. and Rao, R. (2005), *The Power of 360 Degree Feedback: Maximising Managerial and Leadership Effectiveness*, Sage, New Delhi.
- Reilly, R.R., Smither, J.W. and Vasilopoulos, N.L. (1996), "A longitudinal study of upward feedback", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 599-612.
- Scott, G., Coates, H. and Anderson, M. (2008), *Learning Leaders in Times of Change*, Australian Learning and Teaching Council, Sydney.
- Seibert, K.W. (1999), "Reflection-in-action: tools for cultivating on-the-job learning conditions", *Organizational-Dynamics*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 54-65.
- Smither, J.W., London, M., Reilly, R.R., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y. and Kucine, I. (2004), "Discussing multisource feedback with raters and performance improvement", *Management Development*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 456-68.
- Snyder, H., Marginson, S. and Lewis, T. (2007), "An alignment of the planets: mapping the intersections between pedagogy, technology and management in Australian universities", *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 1-16.
- Taylor, S.J. and Bogdan, R. (1998), *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource*, 3rd ed., Wiley, New York, NY.
- Tornow, W.M. and London, M. (1998), *Maximising the Value of 360-degree Feedback: A Process for Successful Individual and Organizational Development*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- van Dierendonck, D., Haynes, C., Borrill, C. and Stride, C. (2007), "Effects of upward feedback on leadership behaviour toward subordinates", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 228-38.

Corresponding author

Glenys Drew can be contacted at: g.drew@qut.edu.au